3

WP 5-2554(01)

IN THE M.P. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AT RAIPUR
ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 499 of 1998

Applicant : Deoprakash Gandle
Aged about 33 years
Son of Shri Kishandas Gandle
Resident of Village & Post Deori (Sangwa)
Thana, Block & Tah. Mungeli
Distt. Bilaspur (M.P.)
(Ex-Mansevi Sahayak Shikchhak,
previously appointed on due selection
and eligibilities against the vacant post of
Asstt. Teachers, under the Edn. Deptt. of
Govt. of M.P.)

VERSUS

NON-APPLICANTS/
RESPONDENTS : (1) State of M.P.
Through Secretary,
School Education Department,
Mantralaya, Vallabh Bhawan,
Bhopal (M.P.)
(2) Commissioner of Public Instructions,
Govt. of M.P., Education Deptt.,
Directorate of Public Instructions,
(DPI Office), Near Chetak Bridge,
Bhopal (M.P.)
(3) Deputy Director of Public Instructions
Govt. of M.P., Education Deptt.
Education Distt. Bilaspur,
P.O. Bilaspur (M.P.)
(4) Block Education Officer
Govt. of M.P., Education Deptt.
P.O. Mungeli, Tah. Mungeli,
Distt. Bilaspur (M.P.)

Application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunal Act 1985 (No.13 of 1985) read with Articles 14, 16, 21 & 311 of the Constitution of India, considered with Principles of Natural and Social Justice.

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

39

Writ Petition (S.)No. 2554 of 2005

Petitioner — Deoprakash Gendle

Versus

Respondents — State of Madhya Pradesh
Through- Secretary
School Education Department
and others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri, J**

Shri Alok Nigam, Advocate for the petitioner.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Advocate for the respondents.

ORDER

(24th August, 2006)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the Madhya Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Jablapur by order dated 2.3.1998 passed in O.A. No. 888/1997, has granted relief to the similarly situated applicants. In view of that order, the petitioner wants to make a representation to the State/authorities for considering his case, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.
2. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty to make a representation if so advised. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur